

**REMARKS**

The Official Action of June 16, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 2-7, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 2-7 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 7, Applicant has more clearly identified the first edge 23 and the second edge 24 in the specification. Applicant submits this objection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert '499 in view of Backus '254, and claims 4 through 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert in view of Backus further in view of Nomura '191. Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections.

Roberts clearly is not directed to an ergonomic product intended to facilitate easy opening and closing of transportable casings used in every day life. The casket lock

of Robert provides a keyway perpendicular to the side of the casket for insertion of an Allen key to open and close the lock by rotation of a roller 13 having an upper slot 31 intended to engage a buckling member 5,7 fixed to a lid of the casket. As indicated by the Examiner, the Robert lock has no resilient element to return roller 13 to its initial position as claimed by Applicant.

In comparison, the claimed ergonomic invention provides a roller engaged in a recess with a length thereof parallel to that of the recess and the edge of the casing in which it is inserted with a portion of its length exposed beyond the edge. This permits the roller to be manually rotated clockwise towards the back end of the casing to facilitate opening of the casing. Clearly, the location of the claimed roller in the casing is entirely different than that of the Robert roller so as to facilitate ergonomic use by a user without secondary tools such as the Allen key of Robert.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Appln. No. 10/621,607  
Amdt. dated December 16, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 16, 2005

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are  
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By N-12  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
C:\BN\L\Lian\LU20\PTO\Amendment-B.doc